

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 4, 2007. Claims 1-40 were pending in that action. The Examiner rejected claims 1-20, and claims 21-40 were withdrawn from consideration. With the present response, claims 1, 4-13, and 15-19 are amended, claims 2, 3, 14, and 20 are cancelled, claims 21-40 are withdrawn, and claim 41 is new. Consideration and allowance of claims 1, 4-13, 15-19, and 41 are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claim 1:

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "indicative of how the new label is used" is not supported in the specification. The limitation has been amended to "indicating a desired text for the new label." This limitation is supported throughout the application as originally filed, such as on page 30 lines 22-26 that state:

"Once the label dialog has been opened, the developer then enters in the desired text for the label at line 602. Alternatively, the developer can enter at line 602 a portion of the desired text for the label. For example, the developer can enter in the text section "customer" or can enter "cust"."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "the user" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation has been amended to "a user."

Applicant respectfully contends that at least as amended, claim 1 satisfies the 35 U.S.C. §112 written description and definiteness requirements. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 2:

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claim 5:

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "a new object" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation has been amended to "the new object." Applicant respectfully contends that claim 5 satisfies the 35 U.S.C. §112 definiteness requirement, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6:

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "an interface" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation has been amended to "the interface." Applicant respectfully contends that claim 6 satisfies the 35 U.S.C. §112 definiteness requirement, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7:

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "a description" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation has been amended to "data at the interface indicating a description." Applicant respectfully contends that claim 7 satisfies the 35 U.S.C. §112 definiteness requirement, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 10:

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "a label text database" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation has been removed from the amended claim. Applicant respectfully contends that claim 10 satisfies the 35 U.S.C. §112 definiteness requirement, and Applicant respectfully requests that the

rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11:

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitations "text", "at least a portion of the desired text", and "an indication of how . . . is used" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation "text" in the preamble has been amended to "existing labels that include text." Applicant respectfully contends that this amendment provides sufficient antecedent basis for "text" and for the other two limitations that were rejected. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 16:

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "the selected label is not the same as the category" is not supported in the application. The limitation has been amended to "the indicated use of the selected label is not the same as the indicated use of the new label." This limitation is supported throughout the application as originally filed such as in FIG. 5:520-521, and on page 7 lines 8-10 that state:

"However, if the use of the selected label is not the same as the new label the developer can duplicate the label to the new label."

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation starting with "if" is an incomplete statement. The "if" limitation has been amended to "determining that the indicated use of the selected label is not the same as the indicated use of the new label." This amendment is supported throughout the application as originally filed, including FIG. 5:520-521, and on page 7 lines 8-10 quoted above.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 16, at least as

amended, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 17:

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation "a label text database" lacked sufficient antecedent basis. The limitation has been amended to "the label text database." Applicant respectfully contends that claim 17 satisfies the 35 U.S.C. §112 definiteness requirement, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 19:

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation starting with "if" is an incomplete statement. The "if" limitation has been amended to "determining that the indicated use of the selected label is the same as the indicated use of the new label." This amendment is supported throughout the application as originally filed, including FIG. 5:520, and on page 7 lines 3-8 that state:

"Upon selecting the results, the developer is presented with more information about the specific label contained in the database. If the use of the selected label text is the same as the new label, then the developer can use the selected label for the desired target label."

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 19, at least as amended, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20:

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation starting with "if" is an incomplete statement. Claim 20 has been cancelled.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claim 1:

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Salomon et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0128272 A1 (hereinafter "Salomon"). Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations previously not recited in the claim. Applicant respectfully contends that at least as amended, claim 1 is not anticipated or obvious by Salomon or any of the cited references considered individually or in combination.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation "wherein the new label is a computer-implemented user interface element configured to identify a control within a user interface." This limitation is supported throughout the application as originally filed such as in the specification on page 2 lines 9-16 that state:

"Communication in different available languages of the business solution software is handled through the use of a plurality of labels. Labels are text that appear on a user interface component, or in a printed document. Labels can be used on menus, buttons, dialog boxes, etc. Further, labels can be used on controls that has label properties such as 'label', 'help', 'caption' and 'tool tip'."

Claim 1 has also been amended to include the limitation "wherein existing labels represented in the label database are computer-implemented user interface elements." This limitation is supported throughout the application as originally filed such as in the passage quoted above and in the specification on page 23 lines 3-9 that state:

"Thus, the category field 234 makes it possible to ensure that a label is used in a proper way for the desired program. Further, categories are a mapping of all of the controls present in the system. Therefore, it is possible to search the existing database of labels

based on the type or category of label desired."

The labels in Salomon, and in the other cited reference, VanDenAvond et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0004946 A1 (hereinafter "VanDenAvond"), are stickers that are applied to boxes that enable people to identify the contents of boxes or enable people to identify the intended shipping destinations of boxes. The labels are clearly not computer-implemented user interface elements configured to identify controls within a user interface such as the labels recited in claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, each and every limitation in the claim needs to be disclosed. The cited references clearly do not anticipate claim 1 at least because they do not disclose the claim 1 label.

Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify Salomon and/or VanDenAvond to match claim 1. The physical sticker disclosures of the cited references are in a completely unrelated field. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not view the cited references and then have any thoughts what-so-ever about creating a computer-implemented user interface element.

For at least the reasons mentioned above, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 is patentable, and respectfully submits claim 1 for consideration and allowance.

Claim 2:

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claim 4:

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 35 U.S.C. §102. Claim 4 has been amended to conform to the claim 1 amendments. Applicant respectfully contends that claim 4 is patentable at least because of its dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Consideration

and allowance of claim 4 are respectfully solicited.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claim 3:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Claims 5-9:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been amended to conform to the claim 1 amendments. Claim 5 has also been amended to overcome previously mentioned 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Applicant respectfully contends that claims 5-9 are patentable at least because of their dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Consideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

Claim 10:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 10 has been amended to remove the previously recited limitation and to include the limitation of "receiving data at the interface indicating how the new label is to be used." This amendment is supported by the application as originally filed such as in the specification on page 30 lines 22-26 that state:

"Further, the developer enters data into the interface indicating how the new label is to be used at lines 603 and 604. This data can be used for searching for existing labels in the label system or can be used when creating a new label."

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 10 is patentable at least because of its dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Consideration and allowance of claim 10 are respectfully solicited.

Claims 11-13:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been amended to conform to the claim 1 amendments. Claim 11 has also been amended to overcome previously mentioned 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Applicant respectfully contends that claims 11-13 are patentable at least because of their dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Consideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

Claim 14:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 14 has been cancelled.

Claim 15:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 15 has been amended to conform to the claim 1 amendments. Claim 15 has also been amended to include the limitation of "receiving a selection of a label from the list of existing labels." This limitation is supported by the application as originally filed such as in FIG. 5:507 and in the specification on page 6 line 29 to page 7 line 2 that state: "If one of the results contains the desired text for the new label, the developer can select the desired label from the results."

The claim has also been amended to include the limitation of "comparing the indicated use of the selected label against the indicated use of the new label." This limitation is supported throughout the application as originally filed such as in the specification on page 7 lines 3-10 that state:

"Upon selecting the results, the developer is presented with more information about the specific label contained in the database. If the use of the selected label text is the same as the new label, then the developer can use the selected label for the desired target label. However, if the use of the selected label is not the same as the new label the developer can duplicate the

label to the new label."

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 15 is patentable at least because of its dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Consideration and allowance of claim 15 are respectfully solicited.

Claim 16-19:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been amended to conform to the claim 1 amendments. Claims 16, 17, and 19 have also been amended to overcome previously discussed 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Applicant respectfully contends that claims 16-19 are patentable at least because of their dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Consideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

Claim 20:

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 20 has been cancelled.

New Claim

Claim 41:

Claim 41 is a new claim. Claim 41 includes many of the same limitations as claim 1. Support for those limitations can be found under the claim 1 remarks.

Claim 41 includes the limitation of "receiving data at an interface indicating how the new label is to be used." This limitation is not present in claim 1. The limitation is supported by the application as originally filed such as in the specification on page 30 lines 22-26 that state:

"Further, the developer enters data into the interface indicating how the new label is to be used at lines 603 and 604. This data can be used for searching for existing labels in the label system or can be used when creating a new label."

Claim 41 also includes the limitation of "searching based at least in part on the data indicating how the new label is to be used." This limitation is also not present in claim 1. The limitation is supported by the application as originally filed such as FIG. 5:505 and in the specification on page 6 lines 5-20 that state in part:

"This display displays to the developer a search function that allows a search through the label text database and access to all of the available labels. The developer then enters into the search engine the . . . desired use of the present text label, the language of the text label, or other information that helps to identify the use of the desired label. Based on the entered data, the search engine searches the label text database, and identifies those label texts that most closely match the desired text, as well as any provided namespace and category."

Applicant has carefully reviewed the cited references and does not believe that either the limitations previously discussed under the claim 1 argument, or the limitations discussed above are anticipated or obvious by the cited references considered individually or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits claim 41 for consideration and allowance.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 41 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references considered independently or in combination. It is also respectfully submitted that claims 4-13 and 15-19 are patentable at least based on their dependence upon the patentable independent claim 1. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of claims 1, 4-13, 15-19, and 41 are respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
Suite 1400
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp